

### REMARKS

Claims 1-16 remain pending in the above-referenced application and are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mirov. As Applicants understand the Examiner, he has the opinion that an intended claimed apparatus does not distinguish the claim from the prior art if the prior art has the capability to use the same apparatus especially in a method claim (examiner names MPEP 2114 and Ex Parte Masham 1987). So it has to be shown that the differences pointed out in the new set of claims based on the amendment of March 06th, 2006 is not only a additional claimed apparatus as mentioned by the examiner but part of the present invention and that the prior art is not able to use it this way. The examiner made no prior art arguments against the new features based on the prior amendment whereby these added features are definitely not shown in the Mirov et al. document. Mirov is not able to assign the allocated microcomputer only to the storage arrangement so that they can operate only with each other. Additionally there is not the slightest hint in the Mirov et al. document to do so or to even think about.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 10/24/06

By: Gerard A. Messina  
Reg. No. 35,952

One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
Customer No. 26646